INDEX
MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
16 October 1963

	Page
SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS	
1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service	
Federal Office Building No. 5, Revised Design	1-2
2. National Capital Downtown Committee	
Area Redevelopment Program	2
3. Smithsonian Institution	
National Zoological Park, Connecticut Avenue Entrance and Viewing Terrace - Revised Design	2
4. Department of Health, Education and Welfare	
National Institutes of Health Addition to Building 12 - Proposed Design	3
5. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency	
Harbour Square Development, Southwest Renewal Area - Proposed Design	3-4
6. District of Columbia Government Department of Licenses and Inspections	
a. SL 64-37, Proposed Apartment Bldg. 2700 Adams Mill Road, N.W.	4
b. OG 64-74, Office Building, National Concrete Masonry Institute, 3121 South St., N.W. - Proposed Design	4
c. Watergate Project, Virginia and New Hampshire Avenues and Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway	4
7. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Capital Region	
Jefferson Memorial, Lighting - Status	5

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
16 October 1963

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: Members: William Walton, Chairman
Burnham Kelly
Gordon Bunshaft
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: C. H. Atherton, Asst. Secretary
C. L. Martin, Counsel
Myra Younker, Editor

I. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Federal Office Building No. 5, Revised Design

The Chairman reported that he and Mr. Bunshaft had had second thoughts concerning the advice which the Commission had given representatives of the Public Buildings Service and the architects on the previous day. Mr. Bunshaft explained that upon further reflection he had concluded that the Commission's recommendation that the project be developed as two separate buildings connected by some sort of glass bridge would probably never result in a satisfactory design. He suggested as an alternative that the architects be asked to prepare studies of a single large building, without wings, set back from Independence Avenue as far as possible. The mass of the building would span Tenth Street as proposed and would be raised above ground on stilts.

In discussion it was suggested that the massiveness of a solid structure would be greatly reduced in appearance if the lobbies at street level were enclosed in glass underneath the length of the building, and that the site should be treated as a plaza under, around, and in front of the building on Independence Avenue and in front of the Smithsonian building.

It was concluded that Mr. Daly and Mr. Yasko, of the Public Buildings Service, should be asked to meet with the Commission that day.

Later in the day these gentlemen joined the meeting.

Mr. Bunshaft and the other members explained the new concept to them. The transcript of this discussion is EXHIBIT A.

Mr. Daly and Mr. Yasko agreed to submit sketches and a study model of the suggested scheme as soon as possible.

2. National Capital Downtown Committee

Area Development Program

The presentation by the National Capital Downtown Committee was postponed until a later date.

3. Smithsonian Institution

National Zoological Park, Connecticut Avenue Entrance and Viewing Terrace - Revised Design

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary, Mr. James Bradley, Assistant Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Dr. Theodore Reed, Director, National Zoological Park, and Mr. Richard Dimon, architect, met with the Commission to consider revisions to the plans for the Connecticut Avenue entrance to the Zoo and the proposed viewing terrace.

Dr. Carmichael stated that in his opinion the revisions based upon the Commission's recommendations at the September meeting had resulted in a better plan and he thanked the Commission for its assistance.

Mr. Dimon explained the changes proposed, using drawings and a scale model of the area involved. He pointed out that, as a result of new grading and a revised arrangement of pathways, the main avenue of old maple trees leading from Connecticut Avenue would be preserved intact, and that only in cases where a tree occupied the site of a building would it be removed. A study of the site indicated that approximately 35 trees in the total area, exclusive of parking lots, presented any problem in the new plan. In addition, the size of the viewing terrace was greatly reduced, the large plaza and fountain scaled down, and the long water moat divided into a series of three separated moats. Other changes in the circulation system of the pathways were also pointed out.

The members thought that the revised plan was a considerable improvement over the earlier design, but that a number of aspects would require further study and refinement, such as the architectural details of the buildings, the sequential relationship of the displays and the treatment of the paths.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the recommendation of the Commission. EXHIBIT B

4. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

National Institutes of Health

Addition to Building 12 - Proposed Design

Mr. Howard M. Biggs, Chief, Research Facilities Planning Branch, Division of Research Services, National Institutes of Health, and Mr. Robert Kidd, architect of the firm of Justement, Elam, Callmer and Kidd, presented a design for a proposed addition to Building 12 to be located on the grounds of the National Institutes of Health, in Bethesda, Md.

Mr. Biggs explained that the 4-story structure would be located in the service area of the NIH reservation and would house a number of employees in the Research Services Division presently located in other buildings.

Mr. Kidd showed the members drawings and a scale model of the building and explained its concept. The building would be located on a portion of an existing parking lot.

The members thought that they needed to know more about the overall plan for the development of the reservation before they could approve or disapprove the design for Building 12. They believed the material presented was not sufficient to give a clear picture of the relationship of the structure to surrounding buildings. It was concluded that photographs of the site, profile drawings and a larger site model should be presented.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter requesting the additional material. EXHIBIT C

5. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

Harbor Square Development, Southwest Urban Renewal Area - Proposed Design

Mrs. Chloethiel W. Smith, Architect, and Mr. Stanley Sherman, Chief, Project Design, Redevelopment Land Agency, presented the design for Harbor Square project to be located near Maine Avenue between N and O Sts., S.W.

Using a large scale model Mrs. Smith explained that the project would consist of two elevator apartment buildings and four walk-up apartment buildings containing a total of 430 units. In addition, 17 town houses would be provided, several of them in rehabilitated historic houses known as Wheat Row, the Lewis House and the Barney Neighborhood House. Off-street parking would be provided in underground garages.

The members approved the project in general, and commented favorably upon the preservation of historic houses and the manner in which they were related to the new construction.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the views

of the Commission. EXHIBIT D

6. District of Columbia Government

Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. S.L. 64-37, Proposed Apartment Building, 2700 Adams Mill Road, N.W. - Revised

Consideration of this item on the agenda was postponed to a later meeting.

b. O.G. 64-74, Office Building, National Concrete Masonry Institute, 3121 South Street, N.W. - Proposed Design

The conference with the architect on the design of the building was cancelled at his request.

c. Watergate Project, Virginia and New Hampshire Avenues and Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, N.W.

Mr. Julian P. Green, Assistant Superintendent of Licenses and Permits, District of Columbia, reported that representatives of the Watergate Realty Company had met with Engineer Commissioner Duke that week and had stated that they did not understand the Commission's position on the project. They requested that a subcommittee of the Commission meet with them to discuss the heights of the buildings in the project near the Potomac River. Mr. Green asked if the Commission would be willing to arrange such a meeting, and if so, could it be set for a day prior to the November meeting.

In executive session, the members reviewed their action at the September 18th meeting, and the letter, dated 19 September, sent to Mr. Green. It was agreed that the letter clearly set forth the Commission's view that the height of the two buildings near public park lands should be limited to 90 feet above the ground. They were not inclined to meet with representatives of the development company except at a regular meeting of the Commission. Moreover, the members thought a meeting would serve no useful purpose if the Commission would be required to merely restate its position on the matter.

After some discussion it was concluded that the Commission would agree to meet with Professor Moretti, the architect, at the November meeting to consider new studies in conformance with the Commission's recommendation concerning the height of buildings.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the views of the Commission. EXHIBIT E

7. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Capital Region

Jefferson Memorial, Lighting - Status

Mr. Sasaki reported that he had noted that the exterior of the memorial was being lighted by temporary lighting equipment. He recalled that in June 1963 the Commission had witnessed an experimental lighting demonstration at which the memorial was illuminated by general floodlighting, and had recommended against this method. Instead the Commission had suggested that a qualified lighting expert be secured to prepare a system of specially designed lighting and had recommended that Mr. Richard Kelly be employed as a lighting consultant.

The members approved a suggestion that the Commission ask about the status of plans to light the memorial. EXHIBIT F

Thereafter, at 1:15 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

C. L. Martin, Counsel

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
16 October 1963

AM
9:30 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

9:35 1. National Capital Downtown Committe

(Mr. Knox Banner, Executive Director; Mr. Melvin Levine, Chief Planner)

Area Redevelopment Program

10:00 2. Smithsonian Institution

(Dr. Theodore Reed, Director, National Zoological Park; Mr. James Bradley, Assistant Secretary, Smithsonian Institution; Mr. Richard Dimon, Architect; Mr. G. A. Purcell, Liaison Officer, D. C. Department of Buildings and Grounds)

National Zoological Park, Connecticut Avenue Entrance and Viewing Terrace - Proposed Design

10:30 3. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
National Institutes of Health

(Mr. Howard M. Biggs, Chief, Research Facilities Planning Branch, Division of Research Services, National Institutes of Health)

Addition to Building 12 - Proposed Design

11:00 4. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

Harbor Square, adjacent to Maine Avenue between N and O Streets, S.W. - Proposed Design

(Mr. Stanley Sherman, Chief, Project Design, RLA; Mrs. Chloethiel W. Smith, Architect)

11:45 5. District of Columbia Government
Department of Licenses and Inspections

S.L. 64-37, Proposed Apartment Building, 2700 Adams Mill Road, N.W. - Revised Design

(Mr. J.B. Shapiro, Builder; Mr. William Shoemaker, Architect; Mr. J.P. Green, Assistant Superintendent of Licenses and Permits)

and riding by, you get the feeling that these buildings down here are set back. They don't relate to each other. One is a little farther back there than the other. It would be nice to get this mass as far back from here as possible, for one thing.

Number Two, there are several things in the scheme where you have one building. I find these things horrible and I, frankly, would like to see a flat building. I don't know if you can use a building 200 feet long, but one building spanning it, setting it back as far as to clear all of this and perhaps, as far as I am concerned, having it off-center, would be better.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Cut this back a little. I don't think it has to be dead center. It is too big. But, we are just throwing these out for consideration.

MR. BUMSHAFT: You have this thick building but without all of this so that you have one, simple statement and this plaza could go under.

The other thought was that this building could be on stilts, 30 feet high, but say you had a 30 foot module upstairs. You would go to 90 here. It would be 90 x 30. Do you know what I mean? You would be framing the Smithsonian without these. You would have a building on stilts 30 feet high with 30 foot modules expressed here transferring to 90, which could be done.

EXHIBIT A

Then, you would have a vista of this very small-scale building. It might be a better picture frame to see this small-scale building in relation to all these big buildings. We are throwing this out as a possibility and we didn't throw it out yesterday.

We are not saying we prefer two buildings or you want to try a building with bridges. My own personal opinion is, I think one strong building, with this plaza stealing in through, one simple statement is the answer.

The other thing I wanted to mention while I am talking is that the architecture should be architecturally, as far as I am concerned, a strong, structural expression, not just a skin with decoration.

Is this reinforced concrete?

MR. YASKO: Yes.

MR. BUMSHAFT: With a reinforced concrete structure, you could get a structure of a solidness that is needed in Washington without veneering and poking hole. I just happen to pick 90 feet because I feel a 90 foot span would do it, but from 90 to 30, the outer wall might be a template module wall but the structure should really be expressive and I think it would create a stong, powerful building and make a simple statement --- this is the terminus and coming along this avenue, we would have --- I would like to see it fatther

back. I say "I", because I am expressing my opinion at this point. I would like the feeling that this avenue opens up and you are not just a few feet back from the other plane.

Now, even though this seems back, that other model, it doesn't look positive enough. Why don't you move this up?

I think it would be nice if this building could be off-center but you are going to have the problem of size. Of course, this is our problem. But even this building, this road crossing under the building, you see, looking back there, it doesn't look too far back in relation to that.

MR. YASKO: None of these are.

MR. BUMSHAFT: The other thing that Mr. Warnecke mentioned, and I think this is very important, that this be a structure with windows and a structure that gives a sense of solidness and this down here be lobbies and elevators so you look through.

So, we are not talking about an opening here but an opening underthe whole length of the building.

What we are really talking about in plan is that the building is that thick and then at the street some glass lobbies in here with some solids here so that the opening is the whole thing. You can look through it and you would only see elevator corridors and get rid of all these little lumps.

In other words, put a terribly powerful building in a park. That is one possibility, if you want to consider it.

MR. YASKO: By getting this back, we are getting more guts expressed.

MR. BUMSHAFT: I think what we mind are all these lumps to cut it up. I don't know if you can stomach the building. This is 130. I think the building is 200 feet long.

MR. YASKO: This can be cut to a module of 120, which would come about there.

MR. KELLY: We are talking about the width, not the length.

MR. BUMSHAFT: You have to absorb all of this; so, I don't know if you can do it. It seems to us if you could move this back, you would achieve something at that avenue.

Personally, I agree with you that to have tall buildings here is not helping anything because it is a let-down. This way, you are confining the picture.

MR. YASKO: When you are reaching this point, your eyes are opening to this kind of feeling.

MR. WARNECKE: The gateway to the southwest is the great plaza that is running under this. I don't think your frame is really going to frame it itself.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It will from a pedestrian point of view. If it is 30 feet high, it is quite high.

MR. YASKO: What you see now, you are going to

open up and you get a feeling of real openess looking through here.

MR. WARNECKE: As I pointed out yesterday, this thing is not a symmetrical thing on an axis. Really, it has a castle tower on one side.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What is it facing?

MR. BUMSHAFT: What we are saying is, here is a pretty wide boulevard coming down here and this is a big park and, theoretically, if you didn't build this building, and the trees didn't cut you off, you could see the whole thing. What we are saying is that you could see the whole thing, if you eye could emcompass it.

MR. KELLY: Also carry the formal thing over to it.

MR. YASKO: This is entering into this; so, this plaza comes around in here.

MR. BUMSHAFT: That is right; so, the plaza enters on this side. You would not have all these things. You would have one powerful building.

MR. WARNECKE: You might have some trouble in this approach. You have that street level for automobiles connecting with the existing street, right in front here, and the feeling of one, great open space. I don't know what you have in here, in height. You are going to need a real base or

platform.

MR. BUMSHAFT: Indicating that this is a change in the grade here. This thing might get to be more ---

MR. WARNECKE: It would be awfully nice if you didn't even notice the road. Cut it so people could walk back and forth under the building.

MR. YASKO: Like San Marcus Plaza.

MR. BUMSHAFT: Of course, this shakes up everything but we thought it would be a better scheme. I think yesterday, we left it confusing. This is one possibility. Maybe your architects might have some others.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Kelly?

MR. KELLY: I only said, as far as I was concerned, if the architects went to the two buildings, forget the bridges and I think it is already a pretty big building. You can't say eight and a half is a small one. This is your administrative problem. I think everybody feels if you set this back, it would make it visually more interesting. If you do go to the two buildings, it would disturb it. I think that at a million seven, it is a little frightening for the people who live in the thing.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is the basic thought.

MR. SASAKI: I think, you know, this gives the designing architect a chance to follow this possibility one step further. The weakness of this building all along has been the treatment of this upper part. I think there is this

excessive tendency to do something different because it is new in Washington in masonry. As I kept telling Mr. Daly, it is the material in the state and I think it could be a much stronger building. I think this much glass would be horrible. If you had 30 feet of space down below, for the general treatment of the lower portion for the lobbies and stairwells and treated it in glass, that is going to be too much glass there. You would not want much more. So, this building could be a very powerful one.

I think if this front area were treated nicely, it would pay proper respect to the old buildings there, which are very sculptural. This building, being this long, would serve as a nice background. I don't think it is the length. I think it is the treatment of the building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I have one comment. Someone mentioned the building need not be on center. This does not exist and is not likely to exist. There is the large, irregular Smithsonian building, dated 1887, that will probably last as long as we are around. So, the whole design is quite different than this. This is just a dream to be reproduced at Freer over here. This should be taken into consideration as it exists and as it will for our time. So, we are not

trying to get the absolute, classical manner. It is totally unsymmetrical.

MR. YASKO: What about this bulk of land which will help us in this direction? We can toss that over here.

MR. WARNECKE: We are trying to say that it should look like something visually. Don't just toss it.

MR. YASKO: No. We will not put a big column.

MR. SASAKI: You might think of putting more of your space down below space. If this is the podium that goes across, you would not cut it down in back.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I want to point out to everybody in this room, the one reason that we are completely off-the-record on this, is the delicacy of the GSA funds. They don't like the idea that we are still debating on this design of this building.

MR. BUMSHAFT: People working in a million seven building, it is a big building and the average person walking around doesn't know whether it is a million or four million. Once it gets to be 200 thousand ---

MR. YASKO: The scale down here is different from anywhere else you work.

MR. WARNECKE: Can you also show the other buildings when you come in and see if this sets back and see if it is going to disturb.

MR. YASKO: We would like to bring sketches on this type of paper and bring in the boxes we talked about.

MR. SASAKI: It doesn't cost very much to make a larger model of chipboard. I think you ought to include the old buildings or the two flanking buildings or portions of it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It is the relationship in which we are interested, just the beginnings of them.

MR. YASKO: The Department of Agriculture and the left side.

MR. WARNECKE: We drove around the Federal Triangle the other day and we looked at the old Federal Triangle. They looked like a great deal of care and thought and respect went into each of the buildings. Conversely, on the other side, we saw one building off 10, 15, 20 feet, like a carpenter who puts a door that doesn't close.

MR. YASKO: I think the other key there was structural expression.

MR. BUMSHAFT: I would like to talk about this masonry. I think you can get a sense of solidity through a structural concept. Either that, or you are designing a wall-bearing building but it has to be structurally beautiful. I want to clarify the word. You can get a sense of masonry, if

you wanted to make this an interior wall on a small scale structure by transferring to 90, especially if you are working concrete in seven or eight floors, your structure will get husky enough to give a sense of solidity. That is why, when you write the word "masonry" in Washington, it means limestone and marble walls with a hole in it.

MR. WARNECKE: What you are saying, you are probably skeptical about plain, bearing walls with holes in the length of this building. It looks like the length of the State Department.

MR. BUMSHAFT: In the first place, it is silly to make it wall-bearing structurally and have to transfer all that masonry to this span. So, you make some system of some scale --- 20 or 40 or whatever you want.

MR. WARNECKE: You have a better chance for light and shadow.

MR. BUMSHAFT: It also gets the glass back on a different plane and that is one way of giving it richness and getting a third dimension and introspective solidity.

MR. ROSZAK: I think I would like to simply suggest, from the purely, overall, visual standpoint of view, if this is going to become a larger unit, and invariably it will, what we really have here is a space concept rather than just a mass one. So, the whole thing has to be conceived in

other space terms.

In other words, I think, as these are broken up, in your terms of opening up the space, it will compensate. I think it is extremely important that the space be considered as a very, primary, integral part of that mass, because if that mass merely exists without the ameliorating sense of space, you would have this tremendous bulk, which was our original criticism.

We are getting back to the fact this is going to be a tremendous mass. We will see it, despite the fact our eye sight is going to be increased. Psychologically, we are going to be aware of it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Daly, do you want to say anything?

MR. DALY: Just this. I feel very much encouraged in the few minutes we have been here and I am certainly in complete agreement with Mr. Sasaki that the glass building, or the building that gives that appearance, just does not belong here. I don't know what architectural treatment should be given it. But I think we have to bear in mind that someone, not I, but someone is going to be looking at this structure for the next 75 years.

MR. BUMSHAFT: The greatest buildings in the world are buildings that express structure.

1c 13 MR. DALY: Several questions were brought up and you talked in terms of two buildings. There are a number of reasons I don't think I want to take your time to go into this at this time, but that has been brought up a number of times before on numerous occasions. That presents some problems. But, with respect to people working in a building of this size, that doesn't give me any concern because I am familiar with the problems of the Pentagon. They get along just fine with people working in windowless areas but with good ventilation and good interior decorating treatments. They are not aware they are closed in, but I don't think we need concern ourselves about that.

MR. BUMSHAFT: This has two entrances in the two buildings connected for intercommunication.

This is all very nice, but will there be money to do all these plazas or are these just on paper? If the plaza in front of the Smithsonian and the plazas here are carried out, is that in the budget?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: On the Smithsonian side of it, we took some action yesterday when we wrote a letter to the Smithsonian giving them support for asking for underground parking place on that exact side of the plaza, with the proviso that the funds be added for landscaping and trees

above the parking area. We took that action yesterday so that is part of the planning.

MR. DALY: At this site we have, I forget what the design site appropriation is, but my guess is at the moment, we have about --- since our hearing before the Senate yesterday --- somewhere between 35 and 36 million dollars to construct this building but that would not include funds for the plaza for our site.

MR. YASKO: It would include this. To answer your question specifically, once over here, we have been discussing it would be anything this side of the street. This side of the street, we have indicated formerly to the Smithsonian people our thinking back here and they said, "Fine, when you get these things, we will take this bull by the horn." They are waiting for us to come up with something.

MR. DALY: If the Smithsonian gets funds to do this, the chances are that the legislation would read that the funds would be available to general administrative services.

MR. YASKO: We found the Smithsonian most enthusiastic and they are waiting until we firm up something.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There is not a separate agency involved in that. Now, you may continue.

MR. WARNECKE: If you go along with this scheme, surely I would recommend that you get these architects, get

their landscape consultant in right now and think in terms of the overall space because, really, this becomes one of the most important parts of the whole design and the building just floats there. Do the quietest, simplest mass you can do. In this approach, I think the details are going to sell this idea.

That is a difficult job. This is a very difficult one to do.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have a lot of pressing business and I know you do.

If there is anything important you want to discuss, please do. Otherwise, we will furnish you a copy of the transcript of this conversation to just refresh your memory. We hope that this has been usefull.

MR. YASKO: This has been wonderful.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We must proceed with other business. We have a room full of people waiting for us.

Thank you, Mr. Daly and Mr. Yasko.

31 October 1963

Dear Doctor Carmichael:

The Commission of Fine Arts was glad to see the progress that has been made in plans for the redevelopment of the National Zoological Park. The revised grading and reduction in size of the viewing terrace greatly improved the design, preserving the natural character.

As you know from the discussions we had at the October meeting, there still remain some aspects of the design which the Commission feels could be considerably improved, i.e., the sequential relationship between displays, detailed treatment of the paths, and the architectural treatment of the buildings themselves. Since these discussions were quite involved, I am attaching a part of the transcript of the meeting for the use of your architect. The transcript might be helpful in making further studies.

If you wish, we will reserve time at the November meeting to consider any revised studies.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Doctor Leonard Carmichael
Secretary
The Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT C

22 October 1963

Dear Mr. Biggs:

I am writing in regard to the design of a proposed addition to Building #12, National Institutes of Health, which the Commission considered at its meeting on 16 October.

The members of the Commission would like to have additional information about the relation of this building to the over-all site development plan before commenting specifically on the architectural design. Material such as photographs of the site taken at eye-level, profile drawings showing heights of buildings, and a larger site model would be helpful in judging what effect this new structure would have on the surrounding area.

We would appreciate having the material no later than 13 November in order to afford the staff sufficient opportunity to study it before the meeting on the 20th. Please call our office to confirm the exact time of the presentation.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Howard M. Biggs
Chief, Research Facilities Planning
Branch
Division of Research Services
National Institutes of Health
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Bethesda 14, Maryland

EXHIBIT C

22 October 1963

Dear Mr. Doyle:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on October 16, considered the design for the Harbour Square residential development proposed at a location between M and O Streets and adjacent to the Southwest waterfront.

The members of the Commission thought that the plans prepared by architect Chloethiel Smith were imaginative and well-conceived. Particular note was taken of the preservation of the historic structures of Wheat Row, the Lewis House and the Barney Neighborhood House, and the careful manner in which they would be related to the new buildings. The handling of off-street parking requirements underground was also commended.

While general approval of the plans was given by the Commission, final action will not be taken until detailed drawings are submitted under the Shipstead-Luce Act, at the time application is made to the District Government for a construction permit.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Phil A. Doyle
Executive Director
District of Columbia Redevelopment
Land Agency
919 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

31 October 1963

Dear Mr. Green:

I am writing to confirm our conversations regarding the attendance of representatives of the Watergate Development at the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on November 19.

It is understood that the architects of the project will present studies of proposed revisions to the building heights along the river as a basis of discussion with the members of the Commission. It is also agreed that the discussion will be held in executive session. Material to be considered at the meeting should be submitted to this office no later than 13 November.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent of
Licenses and Permits
District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

cc: Mr. Duncan

EXHIBIT E

29 October 1963

Dear Mr. Jett:

Mr. Walton asked me to check on the current status of the night illumination of the Jefferson Memorial.

At the October meeting of the Commission, several members visited the Memorial and were surised to see it lighted with the temporary equipment which had been recommended against after viewing the experimental lighting last June.

Will you kindly let us know what has happened to the plans for specially designed lighting, and whether Mr. Kelly is to be retained as a consultant in this study?

Sincerely yours,

L. R. Wilson
Secretary

Mr. T. Sutton Jett
Regional Director
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

EXHIBIT F